

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of May 12, 2009, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-5, 7, 13-17, 19-24, 30, 32-35, 37, 42-44, 46-50, 54-56, 58, 60-61 have been amended, claims 9, 31, and 57 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-8, 10-30, 32-56, and 58-61 thus remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 38 to be in a more preferred form, and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 1-12, 17-18, 28, 30-32, 35-51 and 54-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,371,734, hereinafter Fisher. Claims 13-16, 19-27, 29, 33-34 and 52-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,371,734, hereinafter Fischer, in view of well-known prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse.

By way of background and introduction only, various embodiments of the invention relate to time slice identifier description (see page 5 lines 24-33 of the application and page 5 line 35 – page 6 line 1) in the following way:

1) time slicing, e.g., by a transmission/reception wherein the idea is to send information in bursts utilizing significant part of the transmission channel bandwidth (see page 6 last line – page 7 line 2 of the application) and

2) a descriptor, which identifies the part of the transmission using the time slicing, the descriptor further identifying additional information (for details see, e.g., table 1 on page 10 and page 10 line 24 onwards).

Embodiments of the invention define the descriptor containing additional information in addition to identifying the respective burst. This provides synergy with the time sliced based

transmission, e.g., by optimizing the usage of the bandwidth (for the advantage see for example page 10 line 13 onwards in the application for further embodiments). Amendments have been made to claim 1 in this respect. Similar amendments are made to claim 30. Original claim 31 is cancelled. Similar amendments are made to claims 42, 48 and 56. Original claim 57 is cancelled.

Throughout the new set of claims there are made the following amendments. The original expression “part of the digital broadband transmission” is replaced with the word “burst”, and the expression “provided information” is replaced with the word “descriptor”.

Fischer does not disclose or suggest “providing a descriptor arranged to identify at least one of said bursts and further arranged to identify additional information” as now recited in amended claim 1. Fischer instead discloses “control information” only for the purpose of identifying the frames so that power can be switched on/off at the receiver according to the control information. However, no additional information is disclosed in Fisher. The additional claimed information has a clear and remarkable technical meaning in the application; please see the descriptor on page 10. Many advantageous features for the additional information have been given there.

Further Fischer is directed to a frame-based technology while the present invention is burst-based technology. The present invention is generally unidirectional broadcast while Fischer is two-way communications. The present invention utilizes a descriptor, which is a significant part of a broadcasting standard – Fischer uses only “control information”, which does not have a comparable technical effect in the field of broadcasting.

Fischer therefore discloses a method of selectively activating and de-activating the transmitters and receivers for reducing power consumption, wherein a hub transmits control information including predetermined burst time interval, such that the remote terminal selectively activates and de-activates the transmitters and receivers (please see col. 1 lines 16-30, col. 5 lines 34-66, and col. 11 line 56 – col. 12 line 13). Fischer also relates to a two-way communication for a group of communicators of which one is a hub. All the signaling that is described in Fischer relates to two-way communications. Broadcast generally means a unidirectional communication to multiple unknown (or known) registered receivers. In Fischer

all the receivers are pre-registered into the central hub, and the transmission and the reception is two-way communication.

In addition, Fischer relates to local area network for communicator stations wirelessly transmitting frames and receiving frames from at least one additional communicator in a Group in accordance with a MAC protocol. One of the communicators functions as a hub and the remaining communicators function as remotes. The hub sends control information to the hubs to establish repeating communication cycles, each of which has intervals during which the hub and the remotes transmit and receive frames. The intervals allow the hub and the remotes to anticipate transmitting and receiving frames, thereby allowing the remotes to power off their receivers and transmitters to achieve a considerable savings in power consumption without degrading communications.

Although the signaling in Fischer includes 1) a “broadcast interval 78” within the outbound portion 72 and 2) that the duration of the broadcast interval is signaled, this particular data is not used for switching parts of the receiver on/off but on the contrary in some cases that information must be ignored. In addition, even in the case of misleadingly interpreting the broadcast interval as the broadcast transmission, the remotes are turned on in Fisher (enable their RF modems) for a longer time than for the broadcast interval. Furthermore, although Fisher could be misleadingly interpreted as signaling the duration of the broadcast interval, this data is not used for “switching at least part of the receiver on/off based on said provided information”. Further it seems that the information relating to broadcast interval must be ignored. This is contrary to the present invention.

Based on the above it is clear that Fisher does not anticipate any claims. The alleged well-known prior art does not cure any of the aforementioned deficiencies, and the application is now in order for allowance.

CONCLUSION

All issues having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: August 4, 2009

By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/aja